

### SeaPort-e Rating Guide

The following adjectival ratings are in conformance with DOD guidance and shall be used in all SeaPort solicitations. Activities can select to either utilize a combined technical/risk rating, or do separate technical and risk ratings. Past performance will be evaluated in two pieces, the first being the relevance of the past performance information and the second, how well the offeror performed. Adjectival ratings for past performance are included. In addition, there are definitions of strengths/weaknesses included.

Combined Technical/Risk Rating Methodology Adjectival Ratings: The following adjectival ratings/definitions shall be used for the evaluation factor and/or subfactors (as applicable) when a combined technical/risk rating methodology is used. The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. Combined technical/risk evaluations shall utilize the combined technical/risk ratings listed in Table 1 below.

<b>TABLE 1</b>	<b>COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATING</b>
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unawardable.

Past Performance Evaluation. The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. One performance confidence assessment rating is assigned for each offeror after evaluating the offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the contract requirements.

There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation. The first is to evaluate the offeror's past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. The criteria to establish what is recent and relevant shall be unique to each source selection and shall be stated in the solicitation. In

establishing what is relevant for the acquisition, consideration should be given to those aspects of an offeror's contract history that would give the greatest ability to measure whether the offeror will satisfy the current procurement. Common aspects of relevancy include similarity of service/support, complexity; dollar value, contract type and degree of subcontract/teaming.

There are four levels of relevance as shown in Table 2. When source selections require a greater level of discrimination within the past performance evaluation, the source selection team shall use all four of the relevance ratings identified below. However, for those source selections requiring less discrimination in the past performance evaluation, the team may use, as a minimum, "Relevant" and "Not Relevant" past performance ratings. The solicitation, and if required the SSP, shall clearly identify the treatment of relevancy within past performance evaluation. With respect to relevancy, more relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance.

<b>TABLE 2</b>	<b>PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATING</b>
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved <b><u>essentially the same scope and magnitude</u></b> of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved <b><u>similar scope and magnitude</u></b> of effort and complexities this solicitation requires
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved <b><u>some of the scope and magnitude</u></b> of effort and complexities this solicitation requires
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved <b><u>little or none of the scope and magnitude</u></b> of effort and complexities this solicitation requires

The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine how well the contractor performed on the contracts. The past performance evaluation performed in support of a current source selection does not establish, create or change the existing record and history of the offer's past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts. Requirements for considering history of small business utilization are outlined at FAR 15.304(c)(3)(ii) and DFARS 215.305(a)(2).

Sources of Past Performance Information for Evaluation are as follows:

- Past performance information may be provided by the offeror, as solicited
- Past Performance information may be obtained from questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of the acquisition
- Past performance information shall be obtained from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPISS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases;

interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officials; and the Defense Contract Management Agency.

The evaluation team will review this past performance information and determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to performance confidence assessment.

Performance Confidence Assessment. In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each offeror shall be assigned one of the ratings in Table 3. (Reference FAR 15.305(2) for information on assigning an unknown/neutral confidence rating.)

<b>TABLE 3</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT</b>
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a <b><u>high expectation</u></b> that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a <b><u>reasonable expectation</u></b> that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a <b><u>low expectation</u></b> that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has <b><u>no expectation</u></b> that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned

## Definitions

1. **Deficiency** is material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.
2. **Performance Confidence Assessment** is an evaluation of the likelihood (or Government's confidence) that the offeror will successfully perform the solicitation's requirements; the evaluation is based upon past performance information.
3. **Recency**, as it pertains to past performance reference occurred. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant.
4. **Relevancy**, as it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the extent of similarity between the service/support effort, complexity, dollar value, contract type and subcontracting/teaming or other comparable attributes of past performance examples and the source solicitation requirements; and a measure of the likelihood that the past performance is an indicator of future performance.
5. **Risk**, as it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or subfactor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.
6. **Significant Weakness** in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.
7. **Strength** is an aspect of an offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.
8. **Weakness** means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.